



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/539,641

06/16/2005

Charles C Hart

2836-USP-PCT-US

6610

21378

7590

08/22/2007

APPLIED MEDICAL RESOURCES CORPORATION

22872 Avenida Empresa

Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

EXAMINER

RAMANA, ANURADHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3733

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/22/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,641

Applicant(s)

HART, CHARLES C

Examiner

Anu Ramana

Art Unit

3733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boschetti (US 4,497,317).

Boschetti discloses a device including a malleable ring member 4 and a membrane or bag 2 fixedly attached to a perimeter of the ring member wherein the bag is made of cotton, a bias woven fabric (Figs. 1, 3 and 4, col. 2, lines 65-68, col. 3 and col. 4, lines 1-63).

It is noted that a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Claims 1-6, 8, 19-20 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kindberg et al. (US 5,143,082), as evidenced by Ellman (US 4,428,375).

Kindberg et al. disclose a surgical device to temporarily reposition body tissues and organs including a ring member having cords 20 and a membrane 15 made of a flexible material that could be a mesh structure (Figs. 1-3, col. 2, lines 56-68, col. 3 and col. 4, lines 1-56).

Kindberg et al. refer to Ellman for examples of pliable surgical materials having a mesh structure. Ellman discloses a mesh construction with woven or knitted strands (see col. 2, lines 18-68 of Ellman).

Art Unit: 3733

The method steps of claim 26-29 are inherently performed when the Kindberg et al. device is used to reposition organs during a surgical procedure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-13, 26-27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rambo (US 6,450,983) in view of Berman (US 5,899,942).

Rambo discloses a retraction device with a malleable ring member 10 and a flexible sleeve or membrane 8 attached to a perimeter of the ring wherein the membrane is made from an elastic material (Figs. 1, 6-9, 16, 18, 40-41, 63 and 66, col. 6, lines 3-67, cols. 7-8 and col. 9, lines 1-33).

Rambo discloses all elements of the claimed invention except for membrane 8 being made of a bias-woven or knitted fabric.

Berman teaches a medically acceptable barrier or membrane material made of a knit or woven polyester fabric (col. 3, lines 52-67 and col. 4, lines 1-12).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed membrane 8 of Rambo of a knit or woven polyester fabric, as taught by Berman, since it was well known in the art to use a woven polyester fabric as a medically acceptable material that is impermeable to tissue and debris.

Claims 14-25 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rambo (US 6,450,983) and Berman (US 5,899,942) further in view of Balsells (US 5,161,806).

The combination of Rambo and Berman discloses all elements of the claimed invention except for a reinforcement member in the ring to adjust the flexibility of the ring.

It is well known to modify the flexibility of a hollow ring by reinforcing the ring using a metallic component (14) embedded in a plastic component as demonstrated by Balsells (col. 2, lines 1-12).

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a selectively malleable ring in the device of the combination of Rambo and Berman by providing a hollow ring with reinforcement, as demonstrated by Balsells, since it was well known in the art to provide reinforcement in a hollow ring to change its malleability.

The method steps of claims 32-34 are rendered obvious by the above discussion.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted under "REMARKS" in the response filed on June 1, 2007 have been fully considered.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 1-6, 8-9 and 11 as being anticipated by Boschetti are not persuasive for the following reason.

Contrary to Applicant's arguments, the limitation "fixedly attached" only requires the membrane to be securely attached to the malleable ring member. During examination, claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification. In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Art Unit: 3733

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 26-27 and 29-31 as being anticipated by Rambo (US 6,450,983) are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejections of claims 1-6, 8, 19, 20 and 26-29 as being anticipated by Kindberg et al. (US 5,143,082) are not moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anu Ramana whose telephone number is (571) 272-4718. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached at (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR

August 20, 2007


ANURADHA RAMANA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700